DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 474 SP 005 790

TITLE	Four Proposals Regarding the Certification and Professional Development of Michigan Teachers.
SPONS AGENCY	Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing. Bureau of Library Services.
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	23p.; Revised May 2 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Certification; *Credentials; *State Licensing Boards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS	Michigan State Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This paper presents four recommendations of the Michigan State Board of Education regarding the certification and professional development of Michigan teachers. The proposals are that a) a system of fees be charged for teacher certificates and permits, b) a competency--or performance-based certification system be developed, c) a comprehensive professional development program be developed, and d) a commission on teacher certification and professional development be established to work directly with the State Board of Education. The recommendation, background and rationale, implementation, and additional information is presented for each proposal. Appendixes include suggested language to amend the general laws to authorize a system of fees for teacher certification, fees required for certification by each state, and the proposed statute. (MJM)

ED 065474

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOUR PROPOSALS REGARDING THE

CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF MICHIGAN TEACHERS

SP005790

Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

Revised 5/2/72

FOUR PROPOSALS REGARDING THE CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF MICHIGAN TEACHERS

Introduction

The State Board of Education has two major responsibilities regarding the certification and professional development of Michigan's elementary and secondary school teachers.

First, the State Board is responsible for the establishment of guidelines, criteria, and administrative rules for the uniform certification, or licensing, of the teachers necessary for Michigan's public and private elementary and secondary schools. The Board is responsible for the certification of persons completing approved Michigan teacher preparation programs and for persons who have completed equivalent programs in other states. The Board is responsible for two types of certification: that which allows people to teach on a continuing, or permanent basis. The Board is also responsible for a system of authorizations or permits to work in schools for persons who are not fully prepared for regular teaching responsibilities.

Second, the State Board is responsible for the provision of a program of professional development for the nearly 100,000 persons who presently are certified and teaching in Michigan classrooms. At present the Board requires the completion of a planned program of experience and training before a teacher may receive a continuing teaching certificate. However, this program usually is completed within the first six years of a teacher's career; it does not provide for professional development of teachers beyond that point.

It is the purpose of this paper to make four proposals regarding the certification and professional development of Michigan teachers. The paper proposes that: (1) a system of fees be charged for teacher certificates and permits; (2) a competency- or performance-based certification system be developed; (3) a comprehensive professional development program be developed; and (4) a commission on teacher certification and professional development be established to work directly with the State Board of Education.

Proposal One: A System of Fees for Teacher Certification

Recommendation

The State Board of Education recommends that a statute be enacted that authorizes a system of fees for teacher certification. It recommends that this system of fees be made effective for the 1972-73 academic year in order to partially alleviate the current funding crisis. Suggested language for changing the appropriate section of the General School Laws may be found in Appendix A of this paper.

Background and Rationale

The cost of certification. As Table I indicates, the annual cost of licensing Michigan's elementary and secondary teachers is considerable—$375,254 in 1970-71. Over half of this cost is incurred by persons receiving initial certification: persons completing Michigan teacher education programs accounted for $64,335 of the costs and persons completing teacher education programs in other states accounted for $62,733. It is clear that persons who completed education programs in other states and then come to Michigan to teach accounted for a disproportionate share of the total cost in 1970-71.

Table I also indicates the cost of providing permanent certificates for Michigan teachers: $25,585 for persons who completed Michigan programs and $16,545 for persons who completed out-of-state programs. Finally, the table indicates the cost of providing authorizations or permits to those people who teach in schools when fully-certificated teachers are not available: $138,227 for initial permits, and $54,035 for renewals.[1]

Precedent from other states. The 1970 edition of the Certification Manual reports certification practices in the fifty states. The survey found a trend toward charging fees for teacher licenses—twenty-eight states charged a fee for this service in 1969-70 (see Appendix B).

Summary. In summary, it may be seen that the cost of licensing people to teach in Michigan schools—particularly people who are trained in other states and people who require emergency permits—is considerable. In addition, it would appear that there is a trend toward a system of fees for certification in other states. Both the State of Michigan and the Michigan Department of Education face a severe financial crisis. For example, in 1971-72 the State appropriation for the certification service was estimated to be approximately $80,000 below what was required. Of necessity, positions were left unfilled and selected services discontinued or deferred. It is therefore necessary that the Department shift the cost of teacher certification to teachers themselves via an equitable system of fees.

---

[1] As the teacher surplus continues it is likely that fewer permits will be issued and this particular cost will decrease.

TABLE I

COSTS OF MICHIGAN CERTIFICATION ACTIONS
BY TYPE OF ACTION IN 1970-71*

	No. of Actions 1970-71	Estimated Cost Per Action	Estimated Total Cost
Provisional Certification Actions			
Provisional Cert. of Persons Completing Michigan Programs	16,790	$ 3.83	$ 64,335
Provisional Cert. of Persons Completing Out-of-State Programs	4,093	15.32	62,733
Renewal of Provisional Certifications (estimated)	300	7.66	2,299
Duplication of Provisional Certifications (estimated)	3,000	3.83	11,495
			140,862
Permanent Certification Actions			
Permanent Cert. of Persons Completing Michigan Programs	6,677	3.83	25,585
Permanent Cert. of Persons Completing Out-of-State Programs	2,159	7.66	16,545
			42,130
Permit Actions			
Permit Evaluation	18,037	7.66	138,227
Permit Renewal Authorization	14,102	3.83	54,035
			192,262
		Total Cost	$375,254

*The estimates in this table were prepared by Teacher Certification and Professional Development Services, Michigan Department of Education.

Implementation of the Recommendation

Suggested legislative language which would create a system of fees for teacher certification is presented in Appendix A. This language must be introduced into the Legislature immediately. In addition, staff of the Department should continue their studies and should consult with teachers, teacher educators, and others to develop an equitable and adequate certification fee structure.

Proposal Two: A Performance-Based Certification System

Recommendation

The State Board of Education approves in principle the concept of a performance- or competency-based teacher certification system which would replace the present Code requirements for certification which are based essentially on college or university course credits. Such a system will include a determination of prospective teacher performance or competency levels prior to each certification action. The Board recommends action to undertake such a system supported by annual appropriations in the State Aid Act.

Background and Rationale

Background. At present baccalaureate (B.A., B.S.) degree programs at approved Michigan teacher education institutions prepare people to teach through a sequence of academic course work and directed teaching experiences. A person who has completed a teacher preparation program is assumed to have beginning competence as a teacher. Beginning teachers are issued a provisional certificate which is valid for six years. Three years of "successful teaching"[1] are required by the Certification Code; then, along with meeting certain additional course or program requirements, a person is granted a permanent or continuing certificate.

Rationale. In the past several years some educators and citizens have questioned the adequacy of this system. Though the vast majority of Michigan teachers are thought to be competent professionals, some question whether or not a sequence of academic courses and a period of student teaching can guarantee competence. What is needed to guarantee competence in handling the vagaries and complexities of classroom teaching are preparation programs based on mastery of specific teacher competencies rather than on general preparation objectives.

Summary. The present system of teacher certification has been adequate to the task of licensing teachers for Michigan's elementary and secondary classrooms. In summary, however, the State Board of Education suggests that a system of performance-based teacher certification be developed as it is thought that the identification and assessment of teacher competence can provide a better system for: (1) preparing people to teach; (2) providing people with initial or provisional teacher certification status; and (3) providing people with permanent certification status. Early evidence from other states indicates that such procedures are promising and worthy of consideration in Michigan.

Implementation of the Recommendation

It will not be easy to design and implement a system of competency-based certification. Below are discussed five aspects that are important

---

[1] "Successful teaching" is defined by the local school district in which a person teaches.

to development of the system: (1) the types of criteria that might be used in judging competency; (2) the levels of the certification process; (3) statutory or rule changes that will have to be undertaken; (4) a projected timetable; and (5) development costs.

Criteria for judging teacher competence. Three general areas are required in the development of specific means of determining competencies: (1) knowledge, (2) performance, and (3) effect on pupils.

Knowledge: Two types of knowledge are thought to be important to a competent teacher. First, the teacher must have a broad liberal education, as well as an area of academic specialization, in order to function effectively in the classroom. Second, the teacher must possess and be able to demonstrate a comprehension and command of the lore of teaching—including knowledge about the processes of teaching, child development, learning, the sociological implications of education, methods of instruction, and the uses of instructional media.

Performance: A second indication of competence may be obtained through a series of performance assessments. Such assessments would be obtained through observation of competence at levels appropriate to the individual stage of preparation and maturity so that an individual's competence could be determined for certification purposes. In the training stages this assessment would be made under simulated and partly realistic conditions. Determinations for continuing or permanent certification would be based on a teacher's actual classroom performance.

Effect on pupils: A third type of competency assessment can be derived from observations of the effect which a teacher and his/her instructional strategies has upon the learning of pupils. If a teacher knows enough about his/her areas of academic specialty and the processes of teaching to be able to demonstrate certain levels of competence, he/she could still conceivably be lacking in effect upon pupils' learnings. A competent teacher must be able to generate and sustain pupil interest and confidence and must be able to produce actual learning achievement. This effect is central to a performance- or competence-based preparation and certification system. This area is complex and controversial and has therefore been disregarded in previous training and certification systems. However, this massive task must be faced if Michigan is to improve its preparation and certification processes.

Levels of preparation and certification. The three criteria discussed immediately above may be employed to judge individual teaching competence at four levels: (1) preparation, (2) internship, (3) provisional certification, and (4) permanent certification.

Preparation: Most aspiring teachers will continue to receive their initial training in colleges and universities. It will be necessary to adapt performance-based systems of evaluation to college-level preparation programs.

Internship: Under the proposed system the university would make a recommendation for state licensure after evaluation of a candidate. Rather than giving the candidate a provisional certificate, however, it would be

possible to give him/her a license as an apprentice or intern—valid for from one to three years. During this time the applicant would be expected to demonstrate—in an actual classroom setting—that he/she is able to perform adequately for a first-level certificate.

Such an internship or apprenticeship would require modification of both the current Certification Code and amendment of the Tenure Act since it is concluded that the apprenticeship period is a time for judging whether or not the candidate should be given a provisional teaching certificate. This would not be a period of time to be covered by the present Tenure Act; nor would it be a student teaching experience. Rather, it would be a continuing learning experience that would include both classroom teaching and intensive in-service training. Competencies would be assessed prior to a joint training institution (college)—employing school district recommendation for a provisional—or first-level—teacher certificate.

Provisional certification: At present a provisional certificate is valid for six years (it may be extended for an additional three-year period). The performance-based certification system could continue this pattern; however, it would require a means by which local school district officials could—without bias—determine the beginning teacher's ability to perform effectively in the classroom. The specific identification of the competency bases on which this judgment must be made do not exist at this time. In addition, school board-administrator-teacher relationships are undergoing a period of rapid change in many school districts—hence arrangements must be worked out to determine who will decide competence.

Continuing competence: The current Certification Code authorizes a permanent or continuing certificate upon completion of three years of "successful" teaching experience and of additional college-level academic courses. The Tenure Act provides for an orderly procedure for discharge, demotion, or retirement and provides further that discharge or demotion "may be made only for reasonable and just cause"—but does not define this specifically. A competency or performance assessment system will have to address itself to this issue in order that experienced teachers may be judged on a long-term—and equitable—basis.

Presumably the basis for making decisions regarding the discharge or demotion of teachers would be similar to that for certifying them in the first place. It would differ only in that it would be expected that experienced and mature teachers would perform at higher levels of competence.

Statutory or rule changes. The statutory authority of the State Board of Education to determine the requirements for teacher certificates is adequate for the issuance and maintenance of a competency-based certification system. The administrative rules governing the certification of Michigan teachers would require change since the Code does not now specify preparation competencies. Act No. 4 of the Public Acts of 1937, as amended, the Tenure Act, which provides that all teachers during the first two years of employment shall be in a period of probation, would need to be amended since a successful competency-based certification system shall include an employment period following formal preparation during which a specific determination of the adequacy of competency to support continued certification would be made, and this should not be a part of the tenure

or probationary period. The general legal framework would require adjustment, but not a drastic alteration, if a competency-based certification system were adopted.

A projected timetable. Following is a three-year plan for the development and implementation of a performance-based Michigan teacher certification system. Note that all phases of the plan will require the active advice and assistance of Michigan educators and citizens.

1972-73: Four activities are suggested for the first year of development: (1) the identification of appropriate teacher competencies and means of assessing them; (2) the determination of those competencies that are appropriate to each of the four levels identified above (preparation, apprenticeship, provisional certification, and permanent certification); (3) the sponsorship of a series of public meetings to seek broad support and advice for the system; and (4) the estimation of developmental and administrative costs of the program for institutions and agencies that will be affected by it.

1973-74: Five activities are suggested for the second year of development: (1) the development of procedures for competency assessment; (2) the development of administrative rules for the implementation of the program; (3) the (continuing) sponsorship of meetings in order to seek advice and keep interested people informed; (4) the identification of administrative actions required for implementation by each set of concerned agencies—teacher preparation institutions, local and intermediate school districts, and the Department of Education; and (5) the approval of the program by the State Board of Education for the purpose of public hearings.

1974-75: Four activities are suggested for the third and final year of development: (1) the final approval of administrative rules (including establishment of an effective date(s) for implementation of the competency-based system); (2) the implementation of competency-based assessment procedures by local school districts which are sponsoring apprentices; and (4) the issuance of statewide guidelines for all school districts for competency-based assessment procedures for provisional and permanent certification actions.

Estimated developmental costs. Two types of costs must be borne in regards the proposed system. First, there will be costs during the three years in which the system is developed. It is estimated that the activities described immediately above will cost at least $30,000 the first year and it is recommended that the State Board of Education seek an initial first-year appropriation in this amount for consultant services, clerical help, and CSS&M support.

Second, there will be costs during the ensuing years as the program is managed. The additional actions required for the assessment of instructional competence will require additional expenditures—chiefly for additional supervisory staff time—by teacher preparation institutions and local school districts. These costs will be estimated, as mentioned above, by the Department of Education during the first year of development (1972-73).

Implications of the Recommendation

Any analysis of teacher preparation and licensing program will be a complex and time-consuming task. So, too, will be the development and implementation of systematic preparation and certification reforms. The proposed reforms of the present certification system will be difficult—and will require the advice and assistance of many people. In particular, it will require the assistance of local school people and persons working in teacher preparation institutions.

In addition, such reforms as those here suggested will create controversy. Some supporters and some opponents of the concept of performance-based teacher preparation and licensing tend to be intrigued by appealing but over-simplified proposals and ideas—and, in fact, some people reject the notion that such a concept can be successfully developed and implemented.

The State Board and Department of Education recognize these difficulties and complexities. However, the magnitude of the task should not deter Michigan educators and citizens from moving forward to define more adequate ways of preparing and licensing teachers.

Proposal Three: A Professional Development Program for Teachers

Recommendation

The State Board of Education recommends that the in-service training of Michigan's elementary and secondary teachers be strengthened and improved. Specifically, the Board approved actions to: (1) seek the addition of a new section of the State School Aid Act to appropriate funds annually to support local professional development programs to be operated through the cooperation of local and intermediate school districts, teacher preparation institutions, and professional teacher associations, and (2) establishment of a professional development unit within the Department of Education to be responsible for leadership and program monitoring of state-funded local district professional development activities.

Background and Rationale

New knowledge about teaching and learning. During the past twenty-five years knowledge about teaching and learning and about the ways in which teaching can be more effectively delivered has accumulated at a rapid rate. Much of this knowledge has been stimulated by federal support for educational programs—including such things as new curricula in English, science, math, and social studies and programs to aid disadvantaged children.

Two types of educational knowledge and practice have been developed. First, there is knowledge about new curricula. Developments in all disciplines—but particularly in science, math, and foreign languages—have been rapid. Both new types of knowledge (for example, set theory in math) and new ways of organizing disciplines have been developed.

Second, new teacher roles have been developed. No longer must every classroom be occupied by a group of young people ("students") and an adult ("teacher"). For example, federal and state programs have supported the addition of teacher aides, or paraprofessionals, in some classrooms. Other districts are experimenting with "team teaching"—whereby several people work together to present material to a class. And still others have implemented differentiated staffing—which defines a range of educator roles including, for example, master teacher, staff teacher, associate teacher, assistant teacher, and paraprofessional.

Teachers are faced in the 1970's with drastic changes in curricula and roles. Parents and students are demanding more relevance and additional freedom. The innovative forces that have created demands for new roles and curricula will not cease but will continue as new ideas give promise of improving learning opportunities for the 2.5 million children and youth enrolled in Michigan's public elementary and secondary schools.

The present teacher in-service situation in Michigan. Michigan has a teaching force of almost 100,000 persons. They were trained at various institutions throughout the country, were trained at various times in the past forty-plus years, have been exposed to a rapid increase in public

expectations for improved education, and presently, work in diverse school situations—from the inner-city of Detroit to the Western Upper Peninsula.

The present Certification Code requires only that teachers who hold provisional certificates must complete an eighteen-hour planned program for "the applicant's professional development as determined by the State Board upon recommendation of the sponsoring institution and, if appropriate, the local school district." Such programs focus only on individual teachers. They do not, typically, focus on an entire school's teaching staff for program development.

Other programs have stimulated in-service training. For example, federal education programs usually include funds for comprehensive staff in-service activities. Several of these have also funded summer training institutes for teachers. Section 3 of the State School Aid Act provided limited support for locally-administered in-service programs.

Most local districts do not provide funds for comprehensive in-service programs. This is alleged to be due largely to the nature of collective bargaining between teachers and school boards in Michigan. This process typically includes agreements on rate of pay, length of school year (a minimum of 180 days is required by law in order for a district to receive state aid), and the length of the work day. However, final actions in the bargaining process frequently occur in a setting where there is not enough money to provide for all local needs—and hard decisions must be made. One vulnerable local item is the local program for in-service training—and in the absence of state designation of importance, this program is frequently eliminated for lack of local funds.

State responsibility for in-service. In the implementation of State Board of Education responsibilities, many actvities have been undertaken—however, the Board has not yet become involved in the professional development of Michigan's teaching force. It is estimated that the State of Michigan presently spends approximately ten million (from both State and local sources) for each day of public school operation. Because of the tremendous expense—much of it from the State level—it is concluded that the State Board of Education has responsibility for the stimulation and coordination of professional development programs that focus on the enhancement of pupil learnings.

Summary. A great deal of new knowledge about teaching and learning has developed during the past quarter-Century. At the present there exists no comprehensive in-service program to insure that this knowledge is transmitted—in comprehensible and usable form—to the faculties of Michigan's public elementary and secondary schools. The State Board of Education has a responsibility to insure the best possible learning experiences for Michigan children and youth. It is therefore imperative that a state-funded in-service program be developed.

Implementation of the Recommendation

Two actions are needed in order to strengthen and improve the in-service training of Michigan teachers.

A new section to the State School Aid Act to provide for local district in-service education. It is suggested, first, that language be added to the billion-dollar annual State Aid Act to provide funds to local districts for in-service education. Thirty million dollars is suggested as adequate for such a program.

The proposed local in-service education program would be administered as follows. First, each reorganized intermediate school district would—with the involvement of local districts and teacher training institutions—develop comprehensive in-service plans for the local districts in its jurisdiction. Such plans for teacher professional development would provide in-service in addition to the 180 days of student instruction. Such plans would include a professional staff and program inventory of the school units involved, plans for curriculum and organizational changes (if any), possible new strategies for teaching and learning, and other relevant information. Such plans would also contain program objectives defined in terms of improved pupil learning experiences. These plans would be submitted to the Department of Education for review and then to the State Board of Education for approval.

Second, upon approval, the State Board would allocate funds to districts according to a per-capita teacher basis for approved programs.

Third, the programs would be cooperatively conducted by the local and intermediate school districts and teacher training institutions. This process would be monitored by the Michigan Department of Education insofar as possible.

Finally, the program would be evaluated—in terms of their effects on teacher attitudes and practices and in terms of improved pupil learnings.

A Department of Education Professional Development Unit. It is suggested, second, that a unit on in-service, or professional development, be established within the Department of Education. This unit would be responsible for leadership and coordination of the State's in-service education activities. More specifically, the unit would: (1) work with a state-wide in-service education advisory commission broadly representative of the State's educational and lay community to make recommendations to the State Board of Education; (2) establish a state center for the dissemination of new knowledge on teaching and learning derived from research and innovation around the State and nation; (3) stimulate innovative in-service education programs and practices in local school districts; and (4) approve, monitor, and evaluate state-supported local in-service programs.

It is further suggested that this unit be established as soon as possible. The unit will require an estimated $82,500 in state funds to support professional and clerical positions, as well as provision for contractual services, supplies, materials, and equipment.

Proposal Four: A Professional Commission on Teacher Preparation and Practice

Recommendation

The State Board of Education recommends that there be established a Commission on Teacher Preparation and Practice. To this end the Board recommends that a proposed statute authorizing such a commission be widely circulated among the educational community and the general public in order to seek revisions, where necessary, before submission to the Michigan Legislature with endorsement and recommendation for passage by the State Board. (Note: this statute is attached as Appendix C to this paper.)

Background and Rationale

The State Board of Education appointed an ad hoc Commission on Professional Practices in June, 1970. This commission recommended extensive revision of existing statutes regarding teachers and teaching. In particular, this ad hoc group recommended statutory authorization of a Commission on Teacher Preparation and Practice.

Two subcommittees were proposed for the commission. A committee on preparation was proposed to be responsible for recommending standards for training programs leading to certificates for prospective teachers. A committee on practices was proposed to be responsible for making recommendations regarding standards for teacher internship programs, certification, teaching practices, and suspension and revocation of teaching certificates. The ad hoc group also proposed regional panels which would make recommendations regarding the issuance of provisional certificates based on the performance of teachers.[1]

The Commission on Teacher Preparation and Practice could provide a broad range of opinion and advice regarding teaching focused on the related areas of preparation and practice. The commission would provide a means to involve the teaching profession itself more intimately in such matters. Such a commission—responsible to the State Board of Education—can fulfill these needs.

Implementation of the Recommendation

Statutory or rule changes. Act 269 of the Public Acts of 1955 entitled "The School Code of 1955" would need substantial changes to make this consistent with the authority granted a commission on professional practices. In particular, Section 852, as amended by Act 46 of the Public Acts of 1967, being Sections 340.851 and 340.852 of the Compiled Laws of 1948 would need amending. Sections 861 to 864 of Act 269 of the Public Acts of 1955, being Chapter 24, Sections 340.851 through 340.864. of the Compiled Laws

---

[1]See Proposal Two of this paper for a description of performance-based certification possibilities in Michigan.

of 1948, and Section 388.1010 (a) of Act 287 of the Public Acts of 1964, as amended by Act 229 of the Public Acts of 1969, would need to be repealed or amended. Administrative Rules 390.1101 through 390.1199, the "Rules Governing the Certification of Michigan Teachers" filed with the Secretary of State July 6, 1967, would need to be amended and substantially revised. Other, yet to be identified, changes may be needed in statutes and rules.

As mentioned, a proposed statute for creating a Professional Commission on Teacher Preparation and Practice is included as Appendix C.

APPENDIX A

Suggested Language to Amend the General School Laws to Authorize a System of Fees for Teacher Certification

It is recommended that the State Board seek immediate amendment to Section 10 of Public Act 287, as amended by Public Act 32 of 1965, to authorize the establishment of a system of fees, making this system of fees effective during 1972-73 to partially alleviate the funding crisis for this current fiscal year. Suggested language is as follows:

388.1010 State board of education; powers and duties. (M.S.A. 15.1023 (10))

Sec. 10. The state board of education shall also have the following powers and duties:

Teachers' certificates and licenses; counselors.

(a) Determination of the requirements for, and issuance of, all licenses and certificates for teachers and the endorsement of teachers as qualified counselors in the public schools of this state, AND TO FIX AND COLLECT FEES WHICH SHALL BE PAID INTO THE GENERAL FUND AND BE SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHER CERTIFICATION UNIT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EVALUATION AND ISSUANCE OF SUCH LICENSES AND CERTIFICATES.

APPENDIX B

Fee Required for Certification

State	Fee
Alabamba	$ 2.00
Alaska	5.00
Arizona	8.00
Arkansas	Not Reported
California	20.00
Colorado	5.00
Connecticut	Not Reported
Delaware	Not Reported
District of Columbia	Not Reported
Florida	10.00
Georgia	Not Reported
Hawaii	Not Reported
Idaho	10.00
Illinois	13.00[1]
Indiana	5.00
Iowa	2.00
Kansas	5.00
Kentucky	Not Reported
Louisiana	Not Reported
Maine	Not Reported
Maryland	Not Reported
Massachusetts	Not Reported
Michigan	3.00
Minnesota	5.00
Mississippi	Not Reported
Missouri	Not Reported
Montana	2.00[2]
Nebraska	8.00
Nevada	3.00
New Hampshire	Not Reported
New Jersey	5.00
New Mexico	1.00
New York	5.00
North Carolina	Not Reported
North Dakota	3.00 - 5.00
Ohio	2.00
Oklahoma	1.00
Oregon	5.00
Pennsylvania	Not Reported
Puerto Rico	Not Reported
Rhode Island	Not Reported

---

[1] Total fee includes $10.00 for evaluation of credentials and entitlement; $3.00 for issuance and registration.

[2] A registration fee of $2.00 is charged for initial certification and $2.00 for each year of validity.

APPENDIX B (continued)

State	Fee
South Carolina	Not Reported
South Dakota	$ 5.00 - 10.00
Tennessee	2.00
Texas	2.00 - 3.00
Utah	Not Reported
Vermont	Not Reported
Virginia	Not Reported
Washington	1.00
West Virginia	Not Reported
Wisconsin	5.00
Wyoming	Not Reported

APPENDIX C

Proposed Statute

A bill to amend Sections 851 and 852 of Act No. 269 of the Public Acts of 1955 entitled

"The School Code of 1955,"

Section 852 as amended by Act No. 46 of the Public Acts of 1967, being Sections 340.851 and 340.852 of the Compiled Laws of 1948; to add 8 new sections to stand as Sections 852 to 860; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:

Sec. 1. Sections 851 and 852 of Act No. 269 of the Public Acts of 1955, Section 852 as amended by Act No. 46 of the Public Acts of 1967, being Sections 340.851 and 340.852 of the Compiled Laws of 1948, are amended and 8 new sections to stand as Sections 853 to 859 are added, the amended and added sections to read as follows:

Sec. 851. (1) The state board of education is hereby authorized to establish requirements for and to issue teachers certificates and licenses for members of the teaching profession and the endorsement of teachers as qualified counselors in the public schools of this state, and to fix and collect fees which shall be paid into the general fund and be subject to appropriation to the department of education for the administration, research and development of the teacher certification unit responsible for the evaluation and issuance of such licenses and certificates. For the purposes of this chapter, "teaching profession" means all persons employed in guiding and directing the learning experiences in a school setting of kindergarten through twelfth grade pupils in which personal and professional evaluative judgment is used. Any such person shall hold a certificate issued by the state board of education and valid for the position to which he is assigned. The state board of education shall request the sponsoring institution to make recommendations concerning applicants for certification.

(2) The state board of education shall promulgate rules, covering certificates to be issued to such persons, in accordance with Act No. 306 of the Public Acts of 1969, as amended, being Sections 24.201 to 24.315 of the Compiled Laws of 1948.

Sec. 852. The state board of education may also issue certificates:

(a) To teacher aides, interns, student teachers, apprentice teachers, and other persons enrolled in teacher education programs leading to regular certification. Such persons when duly recognized by the state board and when assigned school duties by a board of education shall be considered as lawfully exercising such duties. Instructional or non-instructional aides may be assigned supervisory responsibilities by an employing board of

education for non-instructional activities of elementary and secondary school pupils in libraries, study halls, cafeterias, playgrounds, and other similar settings.

(b) To public pre-school and nursery school teachers.

(c) To persons with instructional responsibilities employed other than as a classroom teacher including, but not limited to, administrators and curriculum specialists.

Sec. 853. (1) A person to be eligible for a certificate shall:

(a) Have an earned bachelors degree and have completed a prescribed and approved program of teacher education in an approved or accredited teacher education institution, or meet such equivalent requirements as specified by the state board of education.

(2) An applicant convicted as an adult of an act of immoral conduct contributing to the delinquency of a child, or a felony as determined by a court, may be denied issuance of a certificate or license or denied enrollment for student teaching, internship, or apprenticeship in a public or private school or have his certificate suspended or revoked.

(3) A person to be eligible for a permanent or continuing certificate shall be a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 854. (1) A certificate to be valid in this state shall be recorded with the superintendent of the intermediate school district in which the certificate holder works in a capacity covered by the certificate.

(2) Before a certificate existing prior to the effective date of this section is valid in this state, the holder thereof shall make and subscribe to the following oath (or affirmation): "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the constitution of the United States of America and the constitution of the state of Michigan, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of teacher according to the best of my ability." A certificate issued after the effective date of this section shall have this oath affixed to it.

Sec. 855. (1) After a written complaint stating fully the alleged facts and signed by a local board of education or other persons has been filed with the state board of education, or on its own motion, the state board may revoke or suspend certificates or licenses when the holders have been convicted as an adult of an act of immoral conduct contributing to the delinquency of a child as determined by a court, or for incompetency, incapacity to teach, or other just causes.

(2) In such case, the state board shall notify the certificate holder of its intent to revoke or suspend and shall advise the certificate holder of the reasons for intent to revoke or suspend and of his right to make written request for a hearing. An order of revocation or suspension shall be entered by the state board on its official records after the expiration of 15 days from mailing the notice of intent unless the certificate holder within that time requests in writing a hearing before the state board.

(3) The state board, within 30 days after receiving a request for a hearing, shall fix a time and place for hearing thereon. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with Act No. 306 of the Public Acts of 1969, and rules of the board, and shall be held in Lansing.

(4) In case of revocation of a certificate held by a person convicted of a felony, the state board of education shall not renew or reinstate the certificate until reasonable evidence has been presented of rehabilitation of the offender.

Sec. 856. (1) The state board may issue subpoenas issued for witnesses named by the board or persons making the complaint or by the certificate holder. The actual expenses of such witnesses shall be paid by the local board or person for whom they are subpoenaed. If the charges against the certificate holder are not sustained and the certificate is not revoked or suspended, the expenses of such certificate holder and of his witnesses shall be paid by the local board.

(2) A person neglecting or refusing to appear as a witness in response to a subpoena or neglecting or refusing to answer a material question, except where he is privileged from answering, is subject to the same penalties as provided by general law for compelling the attendance and testimony of witnesses before courts of record.

Sec. 857. Any party may appeal from the decision of the state board of education to the circuit court of Ingham County. The local board or persons desiring to make an appeal, within 20 days after a decision has been rendered therein, shall give notice to the state board of an appeal to the circuit court and shall also serve a copy thereof either personally or by certified mail on the state board. The state board, within 45 days thereafter, shall file the complaint, notice, answer and all other papers filed in the cause with the clerk of the Ingham County Circuit Court. The same fee shall be paid and within the same time as provided by law for appeals from the district court to the circuit court. After the appeal has been completed and the papers filed in the circuit court, the same proceedings shall be had as on an appeal of a civil case from the district court.

Sec. 858. (1) There shall be established a commission on the certification of teachers and standards for teacher practice responsible for the initiation and recommendation of rules and regulations concerning certification and practice, including the revocation or suspension of teacher certificates and such other affairs as may be delegated to it by the board. The commission's responsibilities shall include the determination of standards for teacher internship or apprentice programs for teaching practice and for determining policies and procedures related to the issuance, suspension and revocation of teaching certificates. The approval of the state board of education shall be required before such recommendations become effective. The state board of education shall appoint a member of the department of education to serve as the non-voting secretary of the commission. Commission members shall not be paid, but may be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties, from the funds appropriated to the department of education for such purpose.

(2) Within 90 days after the effective date of this act, the state board of education shall provide for the nomination of a representative panel of candidates for membership on the commission by the organizations of the educational professions, and from this panel shall appoint no less than 11 public school classroom teachers, 2 public school administrators, a school board member, and 3 representatives of non-public schools. In addition, the board shall select 3 representatives of the public teacher education institutions and 1 representative of the non-public teacher education institutions.

(3) Members of the commission shall be appointed for 3-year terms, except that 7 of the first appointments shall be for 1-year terms, 7 for two, and 7 for three. At the expiration of each term of office, commission members shall be replaced in the manner described above for initial establishment of the commission. The state superintendent shall fill any vacancy by appointment for the unexpired term.

Sec. 859. Annually from its membership the commission shall designate 5-member hearing boards, of whom at least 3 members shall be classroom teachers. These hearing boards may hear for the state board of education such valid charges identified in Section 855 of this chapter, and recommend action to the state board of education. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The hearing shall be public or private at the option of the teacher affected.

(b) Both the teacher and the person filing charges may be represented by counsel.

(c) Testimony at hearings shall be on oath or affirmation.

(d) The hearing board shall employ a stenographer who shall make a full record of the proceedings of such hearings, and who shall within 30 days after conclusion thereof furnish the hearing board and the teacher affected thereby with a copy of the transcript of such record, which shall be certified to be complete and correct.

(e) The hearing board shall have the power to subpoena witnesses and documentary evidence, and shall do so at its own motion or at the request of the teacher against whom charges have been made. If any person shall refuse to appear and testify and answer to any subpoena issued by the hearing board, such hearing board may petition the circuit court of the county stating forth the facts, which court shall thereupon issue subpoena commanding such person to appear before the hearing board and to testify as to the matters being inquired into. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as contempt thereof.

(f) Any hearing held for the revocation or suspension of a certificate as provided in this act must be concluded by a recommendation to the state board of education within 45 days after the termination of the hearing. The final decision and action on certificate revocation or suspension must rest with the state board of education.

(g) No action shall be taken resulting in a recommendation to the state board for the revocation or suspension of a certificate except by a majority vote of the members of the hearing board.

(h) The hearing board shall provide the teacher affected with a copy of its recommendation to the state board of education. Within 20 days the teacher may file written objections with the state board of education.

Such appeals of action of the hearing board shall be considered by the state board of education prior to its final decision and action on certificate revocation or suspension.

Sec. 2. Sections 861 to 864 of Act No. 269 of the Public Acts of 1955, being Chapter 24, Sections 340.861 to 340.864 of the Compiled Laws of 1948, and Section 388.1010 (a) of Act 287, P.A. of 1964 are repealed.